

These are the tentative rulings for civil law and motion matters set for Tuesday, October 7, 2014, at 8:30 a.m. in the Placer County Superior Court. The tentative ruling will be the court's final ruling unless notice of appearance and request for oral argument are given to all parties and the court by 4:00 p.m. today, Monday, October 6, 2014. Notice of request for oral argument to the court must be made by calling (916) 408-6481. Requests for oral argument made by any other method will not be accepted. Prevailing parties are required to submit orders after hearing to the court within 10 court days of the scheduled hearing date, and after approval as to form by opposing counsel. Court reporters are not provided by the court. Parties may provide a court reporter at their own expense.

NOTE: Effective July 1, 2014, all telephone appearances will be governed by Local Rule 20.8. More information is available at the court's website, www.placer.courts.ca.gov.

EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE NOTED, THESE TENTATIVE RULINGS ARE ISSUED BY COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. JACQUES AND IF ORAL ARGUMENT IS REQUESTED, ORAL ARGUMENT WILL BE HEARD IN DEPARTMENT 40, LOCATED AT 10820 JUSTICE CENTER DRIVE, ROSEVILLE, CALIFORNIA.

1. M-CV-0059739 Horton, Gary R. vs. GE Capital Retail Bank

Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Complaint

Defendant and Cross-Complainant GE Capital Retail Bank's ("GE Capital's") Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Complaint is granted.

Summary judgment may be granted where there is no triable issue as to any material fact, and moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c). Defendants moving for summary judgment bear the burden of persuasion that one or more elements of the causes of action in question cannot be established, or that there is a complete defense thereto. Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2); *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 826, 850. If the moving party carries its initial burden of production to make a prima facie showing that there are no triable issues of material fact, the burden shifts to the opposing party to make a prima facie showing of the existence of a triable issue of material fact. *Id.*

GE Capital submits evidence to establish that no agreement existed between the parties with respect to acceptance of payment of \$1,820.42 in full settlement of plaintiff's debt. The terms of the agreement between the parties required that communications concerning satisfaction of disputed amounts be delivered to a particular address, different than the address for regular payments. Plaintiff's counsel delivered the subject payment to an incorrect address, despite clear and conspicuous language in the credit card agreement and billing statement regarding a designated address for such correspondence. Accordingly, the debt was not discharged by GE Capital's acceptance of payment of \$1,820.42. Comm. Code § 3311. As GE's acceptance of this payment did not create an accord and satisfaction which discharged the remainder of

plaintiff's debt, plaintiff cannot establish his causes of action for breach of contract, conversion or declaratory relief.

Based on the foregoing, GE Capital's unopposed Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Complaint is granted.

Motion for Summary Judgment on Cross-Complaint

GE Capital's Motion for Summary Judgment on its Cross-Complaint is granted.

GE Capital has submitted evidence to establish an agreement between the parties by which defendant extended credit to plaintiff pursuant to the Credit Card Agreement, a balance remaining on the account which is due and owing, and plaintiff's failure to make payments on the amount owed as required. As the motion is unopposed, plaintiff fails to establish a triable issue of fact with respect to any elements of GE Capital's claims.

If oral argument is requested, GE Capital's request for telephonic appearance is granted. All telephonic appearances are governed by Local Rule 20.8.

2. M-CV-0060679 Smith, Tim vs. Sportsmans Gun Room, Inc., et al

Appearance required. Plaintiff is advised that the notice of motion must include notice of the court's tentative ruling procedures. Local Rule 20.2.3(C).

Plaintiff's Motion for Order Compelling Responses to Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories and Demand for Production is granted. Defendant Sabrina Donohue shall serve verified responses to the subject discovery requests, without objections, by no later than October 28, 2014.

Plaintiff's request for sanctions is denied. The notice of motion fails to set forth the statutory authority for the request. Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.040; Local Rule 20.2.4(E). Further, the motion was unopposed. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2030.290(c), 2031.300(c). Although California Rules of Court, rule 3.1348(a) purports to authorize sanctions if a motion is unopposed, the court declines to do so, as the specific statute governing this discovery authorizes sanctions only if the motion was unsuccessfully made or opposed. Any order imposing sanctions under the California Rules of Court must conform to the conditions of one or more of the statutes authorizing sanctions. *Trans-Action Commercial Investors, Ltd. v. Firmaterr Inc.* (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 352, 355.

3. M-CV-0060759 Retailers' Credit Ass'n vs. Costillo, Francisca, et al

Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Correct Clerical Error in Judgment and Amend Judgment Nunc Pro Tunc is granted. Defendant Francisca Costillo's name as set forth in the judgment entered on June 30, 2014, shall be amended to read "Francisca Castillo".

4. M-CV-0061771 Nationstar Mortgage, LLC vs. Tinker, Sonika J.E., et al

Plaintiff's request for judicial notice is granted. Defendant's request for judicial notice is granted as to Exhibits A and C, and otherwise denied. Exhibit B is not a court order granting a stay in Case No. MCV-50712, but rather tentative rulings issued prior to the hearing. However, on its own motion, the court takes judicial notices of minutes from the July 7, 2011 hearing indicating that the tentative ruling was adopted. Exhibit D is not a document of which the court may take judicial notice.

Defendants have filed a Demurrer to Unlawful Detainer Complaint; Request for Enforcement of Prior Court Order and in the Alternative Request for Stay. The demurrer is overruled as the complaint states a valid cause of action for unlawful detainer. Defendants' request for a stay of this action pending completion of a related federal court action is granted.

As demonstrated by defendants, Placer County Superior Court Case No. MCV-50712 is a previously filed unlawful detainer action against the same defendants relating to the same property as this action, which remains pending. Defendants sought, and were granted, a stay in the prior case pending resolution of defendants' federal complaint which challenged the validity of the foreclosure of the subject property. Plaintiff articulates no compelling reason why transfer of the note and deed of trust to a separate entity should subject defendants to having to defend against unlawful detainer proceedings, when the intent of the order obtained in the previously filed, and still pending, unlawful detainer action was clearly to stay unlawful detainer proceedings against defendants.

If oral argument is requested, plaintiff's request for telephonic appearance is granted. **The court's telephonic appearance system is not available for this case. The court will contact counsel at the time of the hearing.**

5. M-CV-0061815 Sunset Court At Stanford Ranch-334 vs. Bowen, Brenda

Defendant Brenda Bowen's Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment is denied.

Defendant moves for relief pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b), but fails to submit a declaration or other evidence showing mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect. Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b). Defendant's declaration is difficult to decipher, largely incoherent, and does not seem to relate in any way to her failure to respond to the complaint in this action. The moving party must show specific facts demonstrating that one of the conditions was met. *Hopkins & Carley v. Gens* (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 1401, 1410. To the extent defendant argues that she was not served, she fails to set forth any facts to rebut the presumption of valid service created by filing of the proof of service. *Foveyor Int'l, Ltd. v. Superior Court* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 789, 795.

6. M-CV-0061935 Demmon Rocklin Ranch Partners vs. Sackett, Neill

Appearance required on October 7, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

7. S-CV-0029131 Westwood Montserrat, Ltd. vs. AGK Sierra de Montserrat

Defendant's objections to evidence are ruled on as follows: Declaration of Gregory L. Maxim: Objection Nos. 1-6 are overruled. Objection No. 7 is sustained. Declaration of Curtis Westwood: Objection Nos. 1-2, 5 and 17 are overruled. Objection Nos. 3-4, 6-16, and 18-20 are sustained. Declaration of Jason Bamberg: Objection Nos. 1-3 are overruled. Objection Nos. 4-11 are sustained. Declaration of George Phillips: Objection Nos. 1-3 are overruled. Objection Nos. 4-8 are sustained.

Defendant's Motion to Expunge *Lis Pendens* is granted.

Recordation of a *lis pendens* is permitted by a claimant who has a "real property claim." Code Civ. Proc. § 405.1. A "real property claim" is any cause of action which, if meritorious, would affect title to, or the right to possession of, specific real property, or the use of an easement identified in the pleading. Code Civ. Proc. § 405.4. Plaintiff's claims in this action seek relief relating to certain features and improvements made to specific real property. If meritorious, plaintiff asserts that certain features and improvements currently in place on subject real property will have to be modified.

Plaintiff's claims in this action do not affect the property owner's title to, or right to possession of, the subject real property. Accordingly, the *lis pendens* is improper and must be expunged. Code Civ. Proc. § 405.31.

The court finds that plaintiff did not act with substantial justification in recording and maintaining the subject *lis pendens*. Defendant is awarded reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of \$2,460 from plaintiff. Code Civ. Proc. § 405.38.

8. S-CV-0029141 Cooley, David, et al vs. Centex Homes

Centex Homes' Motion for Leave to File First Amended Cross-Complaint is granted.

The court's discretion will usually be exercised liberally to permit amendment of the pleadings. *Nestle v. Santa Monica* (1972) 6 Cal.3d 920, 939. Courts must apply a policy of great liberality in permitting amendments to the complaint "at any stage of the proceedings, up to and including trial," unless prejudice to the adverse party is shown. *Atkinson v. Elk Corp.* (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 739, 761. That permitting amendment may expand the case by adding new causes of action requiring additional discovery does not constitute prejudice sufficient to deny leave to amend. See *Hirsa v. Superior Court* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 486, 490. The court will not, at this stage, determine the validity of the proposed amendments. See *Kittredge Sports Co. v. Superior Court* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d 1045, 1048.

Centex Homes shall file and serve its first amended cross-complaint by no later than October 21, 2014.

9. S-CV-0030291 Hay, Brenda vs. El Dorado County Office Education, et al

Plaintiff's Motion to Modify the Date of Payment of Sanctions is granted in part. The motion is granted with respect to sanctions of \$652 owed by plaintiff. Plaintiff may commence payments of \$100 per month beginning October 15, 2014. The motion is denied with respect to remaining sanctions owed to defendants of \$1,247, which is the sole and separate obligation of plaintiff's attorney.

10. S-CV-0030541 Nersesyan, Svetlana vs. Bank of America, N.A.

This tentative ruling is issued by the Honorable Mark S. Curry. If oral argument is requested, it shall be heard on October 7, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 32.

Defendant's request for judicial notice is granted.

Plaintiff seeks relief from the court's order dismissing her complaint following proceedings after remittitur. In this action, the trial court issued an order sustaining defendant Bank of America, N.A. ("BANA's") demurrer to the complaint without leave to amend in May 2012, and judgment was entered in BANA's favor on October 9, 2012. Plaintiff timely filed a notice of appeal, and the Court of Appeal heard oral argument on December 16, 2013. On February 5, 2014, the Court of Appeal issued a decision finding that the trial court erred by not permitting plaintiff leave to amend certain causes of action in the complaint. The case was remanded to allow plaintiff to amend the complaint with respect to certain causes of action.

Code of Civil Procedure section 472b states in relevant part:

... When an order sustaining a demurrer without leave to amend is reversed or otherwise remanded by any order issued by a reviewing court, any amended complaint shall be filed within 30 days after the clerk of the reviewing court mails notice of the issuance of the remittitur.

The clerk of the Court of Appeal served notice of the issuance of remittitur on April 8, 2014. On April 10, 2014, the Placer County Superior Court served a notice of hearing on appeal after remittitur, setting the hearing for June 20, 2014. At the June 20 hearing date, BANA moved to dismiss the complaint based on plaintiff's failure to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 472b. The court directed the parties to brief the issue, and the matter was set for hearing on July 29, 2014.

In opposing BANA's motion to dismiss, plaintiff asked the court to grant relief pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b), based on her attorney's mistake of law, resulting in the failure to timely file an amended complaint following remand. On July 30, the court issued a ruling granting the motion to dismiss under Code of Civil Procedure section 472b and the reasoning of *Pagarigan v. Aetna U.S. Healthcare of Cal.* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 38. The court expressly found no grounds for relief under Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b).

By the instant motion, plaintiff again asks the court to relieve her from the failure to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 472b based on a mistake of law, under Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b). BANA argues that plaintiff's motion constitutes a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1008. Section 1008 governs applications to reconsider any order of a judge or court, and applications for renewal of a previous motion. A motion for reconsideration is one "that explicitly directs the court's attention to a previous order and seeks to 'modify, amend, or revoke [that] order.'" Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(a); *Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp.* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 868, 889. Plaintiff's motion would constitute an application to reconsider the prior order under the language of Section 1008.

However, to the extent a conflict exists between the mandatory relief provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b) and Code of Civil Procedure section 1008, at least one appellate court decision has held that any such conflict must be resolved in favor of determining whether relief is warranted under section 473(b). *Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp.*, *supra*, 179 Cal.App.4th at 894. Although a more recent case declined to follow the holding of *Standard Microsystems* (*Even Zohar Construction & Remodeling, Inc. v. Bellaire Townhouses, LLC* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 277), the California Supreme Court has since granted a petition for review in that case which remains pending. *Even Zohar Construction & Remodeling, Inc. v. Bellaire Townhouses*, Case No. S210804 (review granted 7/17/13).

Based on the reasoning of *Standard Microsystems*, the court shall consider the sufficiency of plaintiff's showing under Section 473(b). Under section 473(b), a party is entitled to relief from default whenever, on timely application for relief, his attorney "attest[s] to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect" in connection with the default. Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b). An honest mistake of law may justify relief from default where the misconception is reasonable. *Fidelity Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Long* (1959) 175 Cal.App.2d 149.

Plaintiff's counsel asserts that although he was aware of the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 472b which required an amended complaint to be filed within 30 days after the appellate clerk mailed notice of the issuance of the remittitur, he was "also aware of the case law which states that an exception to that deadline exists when the case is remanded for further proceedings." (Mellen decl., ¶ 13.) The declaration does not identify the purported case law supporting this statement. The memorandum of points and authorities argues that "an apparent exception exists" to the requirements of Section 472b. However, the cases cited state only the general proposition that upon remand a trial court must conform to the directions of the reviewing court. It is entirely unclear how this general proposition conflicts with the requirements of Section 472b, or would have prevented plaintiff from timely filing an amended complaint, or moving for leave to amend to state additional causes of action, or seeking clarification prior to expiration of the deadline to file the amended complaint.

Whether a dismissal based on the failure to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 472b could be set aside based on mistake of law was the precise issue determined in *Pagarigan v. Aetna U.S. Healthcare of Cal., Inc.* (2007) 158 Cal.App.4th 38. The Court of Appeal in *Pagarigan* rejected this argument on the grounds that the mistake of law attested to by plaintiffs was unreasonable. "As the trial court remarked during argument, section 472b of the Code of

Civil Procedure is ‘absolutely completely clear.’” *Id.* at 44. As in *Pagarigan*, plaintiff’s counsel asserts that he was well aware of the governing provision of law, but deliberately chose to wait until the trial court’s hearing on further proceedings after remittitur to seek clarification regarding plaintiff’s ability to amend. Plaintiff’s argument that an ambiguity or conflict exists is unpersuasive. Under the plain wording of the statute, as well as the reasoning supporting the decision in *Pagarigan*, the professed mistake of law was unreasonable.

Plaintiff’s Motion for Relief From Default Pursuant to C.C.P. § 473(b) is DENIED.

If oral argument is requested, plaintiff’s request for telephonic appearance is granted. All telephonic appearances are governed by Local Rule 20.8.

11. S-CV-0030637 Agutos, Florencio, et al vs. Centex Homes

Centex Homes’ Motion for Leave to File First Amended Cross-Complaint is granted.

The court's discretion will usually be exercised liberally to permit amendment of the pleadings. *Nestle v. Santa Monica* (1972) 6 Cal.3d 920, 939. Courts must apply a policy of great liberality in permitting amendments to the complaint “at any stage of the proceedings, up to and including trial,” unless prejudice to the adverse party is shown. *Atkinson v. Elk Corp.* (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 739, 761. That permitting amendment may expand the case by adding new causes of action requiring additional discovery does not constitute prejudice sufficient to deny leave to amend. *See Hirsu v. Superior Court* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 486, 490. The court will not, at this stage, determine the validity of the proposed amendments. *See Kittredge Sports Co. v. Superior Court* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d 1045, 1048.

Centex Homes shall file and serve its first amended cross-complaint by no later than October 21, 2014.

12. S-CV-0032277 Taylor, Dennis, et al vs. Bradford, Marta

The Petitions to Compromise Minor’s Claims of minors Evan Taylor and Peyton Taylor are granted. If oral argument is requested, appearance of the minors is excused.

13. S-CV-0032679 International Fidelity Insurance Co. vs. Tolani, Tony, et al

The Motion for Summary Adjudication is continued to October 14, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

14. S-CV-0033533 Davis, Thomas, et al vs. Ford Motor Company

The Motion for Summary Judgment is continued to October 14, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

15. S-CV-0034057 Le, Thanh vs. Sushi Unlimited LLC

The Motion to Compel was continued to October 21, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

16. S-CV-0034081 Leung, Arthur vs. Padilla, Hector, et al

Defendant Construction Area Signs, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Answers to Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories, and Response to Request for Production of Documents is granted. Plaintiffs shall serve verified responses, without objections, to the subject discovery by no later than October 17, 2014.

Plaintiff's request for attorneys' fees is denied. The notice of motion fails to cite the appropriate legal authority for the request for sanctions. Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.040; Local Rule 20.2.4(E). Further, plaintiffs do not oppose the motion. *See* Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2030.290(c), 2031.300(c). Although California Rules of Court, rule 3.1348(a) purports to authorize sanctions if a motion is unopposed, the court declines to do so, as the specific statute governing this discovery authorizes sanctions only if the motion was unsuccessfully made or opposed. Any order imposing sanctions under the California Rules of Court must conform to the conditions of one or more of the statutes authorizing sanctions. *Trans-Action Commercial Investors, Ltd. v. Firmaterr Inc.* (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 352, 355.

17. S-CV-0034103 Rodemann, Paul A. vs. EMC Mortgage, Inc., et al

The Demurrer to First Amended Complaint is continued to October 28, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 32 to be heard by the Honorable Mark S. Curry.

18. S-CV-0034283 Cotter, Kevin vs. Buchner, Willie, et al

Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees is granted in part.

Defendant requests all attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in this action, following the court's order granting defendant's special motion to strike. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16(c)(1), defendant is entitled to recover reasonable fees and costs incurred on the motion to strike, but not the entire litigation. *Lafayette Morehouse, Inc. v. Chronicle Pub. Co.* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 1379, 1383. The court has reviewed the billing statements attached to the declaration of counsel. Based upon that review, defendant is awarded reasonable attorneys' fees of \$2,805, and costs of \$495, for a total of \$3,300.

19. S-CV-0034405 Noziska, Joanne, et al vs. Christensen, Todd, M.D., et al

Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Demurrer

Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Defendant's Demurrer is denied.

The first amended complaint filed by plaintiffs supercedes the original complaint. Defendants may demur to a complaint (including, as in this case, an amended complaint) within

30 days of service of that pleading. Code Civ. Proc. § 430.40. Plaintiffs offer no authority for the argument that defendants waived the right to assert objections to the first amended complaint by failing to demur to what is now an inoperative pleading.

Defendant's Demurrer to First Amended Complaint

Defendant Sutter Auburn Faith Hospital's ("Sutter's") Demurrer to the Second Cause of Action in the First Amended Complaint is sustained without leave to amend.

Sutter is a medical care facility in Placer County, where plaintiff Joanne Noziska received medical treatment. (FAC, ¶¶ 1, 5.) Plaintiffs' second cause of action alleges strict liability against all defendants, including Sutter. As a provider of medical services, Sutter cannot be held liable for strict liability. *San Diego Hosp. Ass'n v. Superior Court* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 8, 13. California courts have repeatedly held that "strict liability may not be imposed against health care providers for injuries suffered by their patients." *Id.* at 13.

Plaintiffs bear the burden of demonstrating how the first amended complaint may be amended to cure the defects therein. *Assoc. of Comm. Org. for Reform Now v. Dept. of Indus. Relations* (1995) 41 Cal.App.4th 298, 302. A demurrer shall be sustained without leave to amend absent a showing by plaintiffs that a reasonable possibility exists that the defects can be cured by amendment. *Blank v. Kirwan* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 311, 318. The first amended complaint does not suggest on its face that it is capable of amendment and, as the demurrer was unopposed, plaintiffs have failed to make any showing that the it can be amended to change its legal effect. Accordingly, Sutter's demurrer to the second cause of action is sustained without leave to amend.

20. S-CV-0034491 990 Reserve Drive, LLC vs. Schroeder, Daniela, et al

The Demurrer to Complaint and Motion to Strike are continued to October 21, 2014 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 40.

21. S-CV-0034801 Krause, Scott, et al - In Re the Petition of

The Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim of Melody Krause is granted. If oral argument is requested, appearance of the minor is excused.

22. S-CV-0034839 Suede Blue, Inc. vs Watt, James Kin Sing et al

This tentative ruling is issued by the Honorable Mark S. Curry. If oral argument is requested, it shall be heard on October 7, 2014, at 8:30 a.m. in Department 32.

Defendants' Demurrer to Complaint is sustained with leave to amend.

As a preliminary matter, the court notes that although the complaint references three exhibits, including the subject lease agreement, as being attached, no exhibits are attached to the complaint in the court's file. This omission renders the pleading uncertain and limits the court's

ability to assess whether the alleged causes of action might be viable based on language in the lease agreements that is not set forth in the complaint.

Plaintiff's first cause of action for breach of contract fails to state a valid claim. Plaintiff alleges that defendants breached the lease agreement by refusing to authorize a petition for re-assessment of the property, prematurely serving Notices to Pay Rent or Quit, and demanded that plaintiff pay excessive legal fees to avoid litigation. However, plaintiff fails to set forth any provisions of the lease which would be breached by the described acts of defendants.

Plaintiff's second cause of action for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing fails to state a valid claim. "The implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing rests upon the existence of some specific contractual obligation." *Foley v. Interactive Data Corp.* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 654, 683-684. Plaintiff identifies no express contractual obligations implicated by the alleged acts of defendants.

Plaintiff's third cause of action for unfair business practices fails to state a valid claim. Plaintiff seeks only damages with respect to this claim, which are not recoverable in connection with a cause of action brought under Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

Plaintiff shall file and serve any amended complaint by no later than October 24, 2014.

23. S-CV-0034887 Scott, Mark - In Re the Petition of

The Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim of Justine Scott is granted. If oral argument is requested, appearance of the minor is excused.

24. S-CV-0034961 Prince, Christopher Bryan, et al - In Re the Petition of

The hearing on Expedited Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim is dropped. The petition was granted on October 3, 2014.

These are the tentative rulings for civil law and motion matters set for Tuesday, October 7, 2014, at 8:30 a.m. in the Placer County Superior Court. The tentative ruling will be the court's final ruling unless notice of appearance and request for oral argument are given to all parties and the court by 4:00 p.m. today, Monday, October 6, 2014. Notice of request for oral argument to the court must be made by calling (916) 408-6481. Requests for oral argument made by any other method will not be accepted. Prevailing parties are required to submit orders after hearing to the court within 10 court days of the scheduled hearing date, and after approval as to form by opposing counsel. Court reporters are not provided by the court. Parties may provide a court reporter at their own expense.